

**REMARKS**

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for courtesies extended during the telephonic conference on July 3, 2007. During the conference, there was discussion regarding a proposed amendment to further emphasize certain distinctive features of the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-10, 12-18, and 22-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 26 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. No new matter has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 16 stands rejected on the grounds of being indefinite. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendment made herein to claim 16.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1-10, 12-18, 22-29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 22-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, *et al.* (US 2002/0129014) in view of Amitay (US 2005/0138007). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Kim, *et al.* and Amitay, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under § 103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the

prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed subject matter can facilitate page indexing by employing reference information associated with a particular page. In accordance with one aspect, the claimed subject matter can include a page index system having a page data store and a crawler component. The page data store can store reference information associated with a page. The reference information can include any information that refers to the page, such as, for example, information found in links (e.g., anchor text) to the page that can be found in other pages, and/or descriptive information, such as word(s), sentence(s), and/or paragraph(s) referring or relating to the page, that can be found in proximity to the links in the other pages. Further, the reference information can be incrementally accumulated over time as additional pages are crawled, and additional reference information associated with the page is parsed and stored in the page data store. The crawler component can fetch the page and retrieve the reference information associated with the page from the page data store. The page and its associated reference information can then be merged and provided to an index building system. As a result, the page and associated reference information can be included in the index of words associated with the page with minimal machine cost.

In particular, amended independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 26) recites: *a page data store that stores reference information associated with a page, the reference information is obtained from at least one other page and is accumulated incrementally from each other page as each other page is crawled, the reference information comprising descriptive information that is adjacent to anchor text associated with a referencing uniform resource locator that references the page.* Kim, *et al.* and Amitay, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Kim, *et al.* discloses a search engine intended to produce relevant results to keyword queries. (*See p. 2, ¶ [0014]*). The search engine includes a crawler that fetches pages from the web and stores the pages in a web page database. (*See p. 2, ¶ [0023]*). The crawler also sends the pages to a link extractor, which finds the outgoing

links in the pages and sends the source and destination uniform resource locators (URLs) of the links to an URL management system. (See p. 2, ¶ [0024]). If a new URL is found, it is sent back to the crawler to be written into the web page database. (See p. 2, ¶ [0024]). The search engine also provides an indexing function wherein an indexer extracts the anchor text from the anchor text and link database, parses the keywords from the web page database, and generates an indexed database. (See p. 3, ¶ [0025]).

However, in contrast to the claimed subject matter, Kim, *et al.* is silent regarding a page data store that obtains reference information associated with a page from another page, stores such reference information, and *incrementally accumulates* and stores additional *reference information (e.g., descriptive information)* associated with that page as other pages are crawled. Instead, Kim, *et al.* discloses extracting anchor text, found in a link to a page, from another page and storing such anchor text in an anchor text and link database. (See p. 3, ¶ [0025]). Kim, *et al.* also discloses an indexer that extracts the anchor text from the anchor text and link database and parses the keywords from a web page database and generating an indexed database. (See *id.*) Kim, *et al.* further discloses determining the rank (*e.g.*, for purposes of relevancy) of a page based on whether a keyword appears in the anchor text or other content of the other page. (See p. 3, ¶¶ [0031]-[0033]).

Further, Amitay fails to disclose the distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter. Rather, Amitay teaches a search engine that includes a search engine to search through an index of documents and an index enhancer to enhance the index with user queries. (See *Abstract*). Amitay also teaches indexing documents, such as pages or web sites, and information regarding each term from the search requests, where such information can be the number of occurrences of the term in the document and the position of the term in the document. (See p. 2, ¶¶ [0019]-[0021]).

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Amitay fails to teach incrementally accumulating reference information, comprising descriptive information, and storing such accumulated reference information in a page data store. Instead, Amitay teaches adding search terms or other details, such as a time stamp associated with a query, to the index or the documents based on users' queries submitted to the search engine. (See p. 2, ¶¶ [0022]-[0024]; p. 3, ¶¶ [0035]).

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can obtain reference information associated with a page from other pages that each have an URL that links to the page. The reference information can include descriptive information that can be adjacent, or in proximity, to anchor text, which can be text that appears in the hyperlink that points or links to the page. Such reference information can be stored in a page data store. As each other page is crawled, the claimed subject matter can *incrementally accumulate reference information (e.g., descriptive information) associated with the page from the other pages*, and such accumulated reference information can be stored in the data store. The page and the reference information can be provided with the page to an index building component. As a result, the page and its associated reference information, as accumulated over time, can be included in the index of words associated with the page.

In view of at least the foregoing, Kim, *et al.* and Amitay, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 26 (and associated dependent claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 23-25, and 27-29). Accordingly, it is believed that the subject claims are in condition for allowance, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063[MSFTP512US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/HIMANSHU S. AMIN/  
HIMANSHU S. AMIN  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731